arXiv:1012.2650v5 [quant-ph] 20 Nov 2011

A quantum version of randomization criteria

Keiji Matsumoto

November 22, 2011

Abstract

In classical statistical decision theory, comparison of experiments plays very important role. Especially, so-called randomization criteria is most important. In this paper, we establish two kinds of quantum analogue of these concepts, and apply to some examples.

1 Introduction

In classical statistical decision theory, comparison of experiments plays very important role. Especially, so-called randomization criteria is most important. In this paper, we establish two kinds of quantum analogue these concepts, and apply to some examples.

2 Review of classical theory

2.1 Desicion theory, frame work

A *statistical experiment* $\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{X}, \mathfrak{X}, \{P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta\})$ consists of four parts. First, the *data space* $\mathcal{X}$, or the totality of all the possible data x. Second, a collection $\mathfrak{X}$ of subsets of $\mathcal{X}$, indicating minimal unit of the events which the statistician is concerned with.

The third element of an experiment is a *parameter set* Θ, which indeces all the possible explaining theory for the outcomming data. To each θ corresponds a probablity distribution P_θ of data, which is the fourth element of an experiment. P_θ has to be $\mathfrak{X}$-measurable.

A statistician makes decision based on the data $x \in \mathcal{X}$. The totality of possible decisions made by the statisitcian is the *decision space* $\mathcal{D}$, which is a topological space and is equipped with Baire σ-field $\mathfrak{D}$. For example, if the statistician is estimating the value of the parameter $\theta \in \times$ behind the data from the data $x \in \mathcal{X}$, we define $(\mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{D}) = \left(\mathbb{R}^l, \mathfrak{B}\left(\mathbb{R}^l\right)\right)$. If the statistician is trying to distinguish whether $\theta \in \Theta_0$ or $\theta \in \Theta_1$, $(\mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{D}) = \left(\{0,1\}, 2^{\{0,1\}}\right)$.

The performance is measured by a *loss function* $l_\theta(t)$, or a function which depends not only on the decision $t \in \mathcal{D}$ but also on the true value of the parameter $\theta \in \Theta$. It is assumed that the function $t \to l_\theta(t)$ is lower semicontinuous and non-negative. For example, in case of estimation of θ, the loss function may be

$$l_\theta(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & (\|t-\theta\| \le c) \\ 1, & \text{othewise} \end{cases} .$$

In case of testing $\theta \in \Theta_0$ against $\theta \in \Theta_1$, $l_\theta(t)$ may be chosen so that $l_\theta(1) = 1 - l_\theta(0)$ and

$$l_\theta(0) = \begin{cases} 0, & (\theta \in \Theta_0) \\ 1 & (\theta \in \Theta_1) \end{cases} .$$

In general the statistician's startegy (decision) is described by a bilinear map D

$$D : l_\theta \times P_\theta \to D(l_\theta, P_\theta) \in \mathbb{R},$$

which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} &|D(f,P)| \le \|f\| \, \|P\|_1 , \\ &D(f,P) \ge 0, \quad \text{if } f \ge 0,\ P \ge 0, \\ &D(1,P) = P(\mathcal{D}) . \end{aligned}$$

Here, P is a member of L-space of $\mathcal{E}$, or a bounded singned measure such that $P \perp \nu$ for all ν with $P_\theta \perp \nu$, $\forall \theta \in \Theta$. The meaning of $D(l_\theta, P_\theta)$ is average of l_θ when the statistician takes the decision corresponding to D, and in many cases,

$$D(l_\theta, P_\theta) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \int_{\mathcal{D}} l_\theta(t)\, R(\mathrm{d}t, x)\, P_\theta(\mathrm{d}x) ,$$

where $R(\mathrm{d}t, x)$ is a Markov kernel. D is said to be *k-decision* when $|\mathcal{D}| = k$.

Note here that Θ can be any set, and the function $\theta \to P_\theta(B)$ can be any function.

2.2 Deficiency

Let $e : \times \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a function with $0 \le e_\theta \le 1$, $\|l_\theta\| := \sup_{t \in \mathcal{D}} |l_\theta(t)|$, and $\|l\| := \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|l_\theta\|$. An experiment $\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{X}, \mathfrak{X}, \{P_\theta; \theta \in \Theta\})$ is said to be *e-deficient* relative to another experiment $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{Y}, \mathfrak{Y}, \{Q_\theta; \theta \in \Theta\})$ (denoted by $\mathcal{E} \ge_e \mathcal{F}$), if and only if, for any loss function l with $\|l\| \le 1$, for any finite subset Θ_0 of Θ, and any decision D on the experiment $\mathcal{F}$, there is a decision D' on the experiment $\mathcal{E}$ such that

$$D'(l_\theta, P_\theta) \le D(l_\theta, Q_\theta) + e_\theta,\ \forall \theta \in \Theta_0 . \tag{1}$$

Deficiency $\delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ is defined by

$$\delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) := \inf_e \left\{ \sup_\theta e_\theta \,; \mathcal{E} \ge_e \mathcal{F} \right\} ,$$

$\mathcal{E} \ge_0 \mathcal{F}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{E} \ge \mathcal{F}$, and when this holds, $\mathcal{E}$ is said to be more informative than $\mathcal{F}$.

An experiment $\mathcal{E}$ is said to be *e-deficient* for k-decision problems relative to another experiment $\mathcal{F}$, if and only if, for any loss function l, any finite subset Θ_0 of Θ, and any k-decision D on the experiment $\mathcal{F}$, there is a k-decision D' on the experiment $\mathcal{E}$ such that (1) holds for any $\theta \in \Theta_0$ (denoted by $\mathcal{E} \geq_{e,k} \mathcal{F}$). Also, we define deficiency $\delta_k(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ for k-decision problems by restricting D' and D to the k-desisions on $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{F}$, respectively. $\mathcal{E} \geq_{0,k} \mathcal{F}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{E} \geq_k \mathcal{F}$, and when this holds, $\mathcal{E}$ is more informative than $\mathcal{F}$ for k-decision problems. For notational convienience, we define $\delta_\infty := \delta$, and e-deficiency with respect to ∞-decision problems as e-deficiency.

Finally, we define

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) &:= \max\{\delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}), \delta(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{E})\}, \\ \Delta_k(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) &:= \max\{\delta_k(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}), \delta_k(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{E})\}, \\ \Delta_\infty &:= \Delta.\end{aligned}$$

When $\Delta(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) = 0$ (, $\Delta_k(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}) = 0$, resp.) we say $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ are *equivallent (,equivalent for* k-decision problems, resp.), and represent the situation by the simbol $\mathcal{E} \sim \mathcal{F}$ *(,*$\mathcal{E} \sim_k \mathcal{F}$, resp.).

One can prove the following necessary and sufficient condition for $\mathcal{E} \geq_{e,k} \mathcal{F}$ [11][13]:

(i) For any loss function l with $0 \leq l_\theta(t) \leq 1$, and any k-decision D on the experiment $\mathcal{F}$, there is a k-decision D' on the experiment $\mathcal{E}$ such that, for any probability distribution π with finte support

$$\int_\Theta D'(l_\theta, P_\theta)\, \mathrm{d}\pi \leq \int_\Theta \{D(l_\theta, Q_\theta) + e_\theta\}\, \mathrm{d}\pi.$$

(ii) For any loss funcetion l, and any k-decision D on the experiment $\mathcal{F}$, there is a k-decision D' on $\mathcal{E}$ such that

$$\|D'(l_\theta, P_\theta) - D(l_\theta, Q_\theta)\| \leq e_\theta,\ \forall \theta \in \Theta.$$

Also, $\mathcal{E} \geq_e \mathcal{F}$ is equivalent to :

(iii) (*Randomization criterion*) There is an affine positive map Λ such that

$$\|\Lambda(P_\theta) - Q_\theta\|_1 \leq e_\theta\ ,\ \forall \theta \in \Theta.$$

3 Notation and mathematical background

$\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{K}$ are separable Hilbert spaces. $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H})$, and $\mathcal{LC}(\mathcal{H})$ is the space of bounded operators, trace class operators, and compact operators over Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, respcetively. It is known that $\mathcal{LC}(\mathcal{H})^*$ and $\mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H})^*$ is isometrically isomorphic to $\mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, respectively. Here, continuity is defined in terms of the operator norm $\|\cdot\|$. We furnish $\mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H}) \simeq \mathcal{LC}(\mathcal{H})^*$ with weak* topology. $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H})$, and $\mathcal{LC}(\mathcal{H})$ is also furnished with toplogy induced by the norm $\|\cdot\|$, $\|\cdot\|_1$ and $\|\cdot\|$, respectively. We can also introduce to the spaces $\mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H}) \simeq \mathcal{LC}(\mathcal{H})^*$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \simeq \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H})^*$ the operator norm as a linear functional, but they coincide with $\|\cdot\|_1$ and $\|\cdot\|$, respectively. Define $\mathrm{ball}\,\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) := \{L; \|L\| \leq 1\}$, etc. Then, by Alaoglu's theorem, $\mathrm{ball}\,\mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is weak* compact.

Given a set Y and topological spaces $(X_y, \mathfrak{x}_y)$, and we furnish $\times_{y\in Y} X_y$ with the product topology, whose local base is a family of sets in the form of

$$\{x;\, x_y \in U_y,\, y \in F\},$$

where U_y is an open set in X_y, and F is a finite set in Y [10]. Note that $\times_{y\in Y} U_y$ is not necessarily open. Note also that, under this topology, the projection P_y from $\times_{y\in Y} X_y$ to X_y, $P_y(x) = x_y$, is continuous. Also, the product topology is the weakest topology whch makes P_y continuous. Tychonoff's theorem states that $\times_{y\in Y} D_y$ is compact in product topology if D_y is compact.

A map $\Lambda : \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{K})$ is said to be completely positive if and only if $\Lambda \otimes \mathbf{I}_n$ is positive for any n, where $\mathbf{I}_n$ is the identity map form $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ to $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^n)$. This is equivalent to

$$\sum_{i.j=1}^{n} \langle\psi_i|\, \Lambda(|\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_j|)\, |\psi_j\rangle \geq 0,, \tag{2}$$

for any $\{|\varphi_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^n$ ($B_i \in \mathcal{H}$), any $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^n$ ($|\psi_i\rangle \in \mathcal{K}$), and for any n. M is said to be trance preserving if

$$\mathrm{tr}\,\Lambda(X) = \mathrm{tr}\,X,\ \forall X \in \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H}). \tag{3}$$

We put

$$Ch(\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K}) := \{\Lambda;\ \Lambda \text{ linear, (2), (3)}\}.$$

Lemma 1 *The set $Ch(\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K})$, viewed as a subset of $(\mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{K}))^{\mathrm{ball}\,\mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H})}$, is compact and convex, in the product topology. Also, $(\mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{K}))^{\mathrm{ball}\,\mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H})}$ is locally convex in the product topology. In addition, if $X \in \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H})$ and $B \in \mathcal{LC}(\mathcal{K})$, the linear functional*

$$\Lambda \in Ch(\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K}) \to \mathrm{tr}\,\Lambda(X)\,B \in \mathbb{C}$$

is continuous in the product topology.

Proof. Since $\|\Lambda\| = 1$, $Ch(\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K}) \subset (\mathrm{ball}\,\mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{K}))^{\mathrm{ball}\,\mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H})}$. Due to Alaoglu's theorem, $\mathrm{ball}\,\mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{K})$ is compact in the weak* topology. Therefore, by Tychonoff's theorem, $(\mathrm{ball}\,\mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{K}))^{\mathrm{ball}\,\mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H})}$ is compact in the product topology. Hence, it suffices to show $Ch(\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K})$ is closed in the product topology. Let $\{\Lambda_\alpha\}$ a net in $Ch(\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K})$, with $\Lambda_\alpha \to \Lambda$ in the product topology. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}&\Lambda_\alpha(a_1X_1 + a_2X_2) - \{a_1\Lambda_\alpha(X_1) + a_2\Lambda_\alpha(X_2)\} \\ &\to \Lambda(a_1X_1 + a_2X_2) - \{a_1\Lambda(X_1) + a_2\Lambda(X_2)\} = 0,\end{aligned}$$

$$\sum_{i.j=1}^{n}\left\langle \psi_i\right|\Lambda_\alpha\left(\left|\varphi_i\right\rangle\left\langle\varphi_j\right|\right)\left|\psi_j\right\rangle\rightarrow\sum_{i.j=1}^{n}\left\langle \psi_i\right|\Lambda\left(\left|\varphi_i\right\rangle\left\langle\varphi_j\right|\right)\left|\psi_j\right\rangle\geq 0,$$

and

$$\mathrm{rr}\,\Lambda_\alpha\left(X\right)=\mathrm{tr}\,X\rightarrow\mathrm{tr}\,\Lambda\left(X\right).$$

Therefore, Λ is also in $Ch\left(\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K}\right)$. Thus, $Ch\left(\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K}\right)$ is closed and compact.

To prove the second assertion, recall that $\mathcal{S}_1\left(\mathcal{K}\right)$ is locally convex in weak* topology, which has a convex local base. Therefore, in product topology, $\left(\mathcal{S}_1\left(\mathcal{K}\right)\right)^{\mathrm{ball}\,\mathcal{S}_1\left(\mathcal{H}\right)}$ is locally convex, with a local base being family of sets of the form

$$\left\{x;\,x_y\in U_y,\,y\in F\right\},$$

where U_y is a member of a local base of weak* topology.

To prove the third assertion, let $\left\{\Lambda_\alpha\right\}$ a net in $Ch\left(\mathcal{H},\mathcal{K}\right)$, with $\Lambda_\alpha\rightarrow\Lambda$ in the product topology. Then, $\Lambda_\alpha\left(X\right)\rightarrow\Lambda\left(X\right)$ in weak* topology, for any $X\in\mathrm{ball}\,\mathcal{S}_1\left(\mathcal{H}\right)$. Therefore, $\mathrm{tr}\,\Lambda_\alpha\left(X\right)A\rightarrow\mathrm{tr}\,\Lambda\left(X\right)A$, for any $A\in\mathcal{LC}\left(\mathcal{H}\right)$. Hence, we have the assertion. ■

POVM over a measurable space $\left(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D}\right)$ in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is denoted by $Mes\left(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D};\mathcal{H}\right)$. The space of singed measures and singed finitely additive measures over $\left(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D}\right)$ is denoted by $ca\left(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D}\right)$ and $ba\left(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D}\right)$, respectively, They are meatrized by the total variation norm. The space of bounded measurable function is denoted by $L^\infty\left(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D}\right)$. Then, $ba\left(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D}\right)\simeq L^\infty\left(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D}\right)^*$. The map

$$f_M:X\in\mathcal{S}_1\left(\mathcal{H}\right)\rightarrow\mathrm{tr}\,XM\left(\cdot\right)\in ca\left(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D}\right)$$

is linear, positive, and $f_M\left(X\right)\left(\mathcal{D}\right)=\mathrm{tr}\,X$. Conversely, any linear, bounded, and positive map from $\mathcal{S}_1\left(\mathcal{H}\right)$ to $ca\left(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D}\right)$ with $f\left(X\right)\left(\mathcal{D}\right)=\mathrm{tr}\,X$ is in this form.

The space of elements f of $\mathcal{B}\left(\mathcal{S}_1\left(\mathcal{H}\right),ba\left(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D}\right)\right)$ with $f\geq 0$ and $f\left(\rho\right)\left(\mathcal{D}\right)=\mathrm{tr}\,\rho$ $\left(\rho\geq 0\right)$ is denoted by $\overline{Mes}\left(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D};\mathcal{H}\right)$.

Lemma 2 *Suppose $\mathcal{D}$ is locally compact. The set $\overline{Mes}\left(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D};\mathcal{H}\right)$, viewed as a subset of $\left(ba\left(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D}\right)\right)^{\mathrm{ball}\,\mathcal{S}_1\left(\mathcal{H}\right)}$, is compact and convex, in the product topology. Also, $\left(ba\left(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D}\right)\right)^{\mathrm{ball}\,\mathcal{S}_1\left(\mathcal{H}\right)}$ is locally convex in the product topology. In addition, if $X\in\mathcal{S}_1\left(\mathcal{H}\right)$ and $l\in L^\infty\left(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D}\right)$, the linear functional*

$$f\in\overline{Mes}\left(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D};\mathcal{H}\right)\rightarrow\int_{\mathcal{D}}l\left(t\right)f\left(X\right)\left(\mathrm{d}\,t\right)\in\mathbb{R}$$

is continuous in the product topology.

Proof. Observe that $\overline{Mes}\left(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D};\mathcal{H}\right)$ is a subset of $\left(\mathrm{ball}\,ba\left(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D}\right)\right)^{\mathrm{ball}\,\mathcal{S}_1\left(\mathcal{H}\right)}$, which is compact in the product topology. Hence, to show the first assertion, it suffices to show $\overline{Mes}\left(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D};\mathcal{H}\right)$ is closed. Let $\left\{f_\alpha\right\}$ be a net in $\overline{Mes}\left(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D};\mathcal{H}\right)$ with $f_\alpha\rightarrow f$. Then,

$$\begin{gathered}f_\alpha\left(a_1X_1+a_2X_2\right)-\left\{a_1f_\alpha\left(X_1\right)+a_2f_\alpha\left(X_2\right)\right\}\\-\rightarrow f\left(a_1X_1+a_2X_2\right)-\left\{a_1f\left(X_1\right)+a_2f\left(X_2\right)\right\}=0,\end{gathered}$$

$$\forall \rho \geq 0,\ \rho \in \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H}),\ \forall B \in \mathfrak{D},\ f_\alpha(\rho)(B) \to f(\rho)(B) \geq 0,$$

and

$$\forall \rho \geq 0,\ \rho \in \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H}),\ f_\alpha(\rho)(\mathcal{D}) \to f(\rho)(\mathcal{D}) = \operatorname{tr}\rho.$$

Thus, $f \in \overline{Mes}(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D};\mathcal{H})$, and $\overline{Mes}(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D};\mathcal{H})$ is closed, and therefore is compact.

To prove the second assertion, recall that $ba(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D})$ is locally convex in weak* topology, which has a convex local base. Therefore, in product topology, $(ba(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D}))^{\mathrm{ball}\,\mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H})}$ is locally convex, with a local base being family of sets of the form

$$\{x;\ x_y \in U_y,\ y \in F\},$$

where U_y is a member of a local base of weak* topology.

To prove the third assertion, let $\{f_\alpha\}$ a net in $\overline{Mes}(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D};\mathcal{H})$, with $f_\alpha \to \Lambda$ in the product topology. Then, $f_\alpha(X) \to f(X)$ in weak* topology, for any $X \in \mathrm{ball}\,\mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H})$. Therefore, $\int_{\mathcal{D}} l(t)\, f_\alpha(X)(\mathrm{d}\,t) \to \int_{\mathcal{D}} l(t)\, f(X)(\mathrm{d}\,t)$, for any $l \in L^\infty(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D})$. Hence, we have the assertion. ■

4 Quantum Theory: framework

A quantum experiment $\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{H}, \{\rho_\theta; \theta \in \Theta\})$ consists of Hilbet space $\mathcal{H}$ and the family $\{\rho_\theta; \theta \in \Theta\}$ of states over $\mathcal{H}$. (More generally, though we do not use such setting in this paper, $\mathcal{E} = (\mathfrak{H}, \{\omega_\theta; \theta \in \Theta\})$, where $\mathfrak{H}$ is a C^*-algebra and ω_θ is a state over over $\mathfrak{H}$.)

From here, Θ is an arbitrary set.

A *quantum decision space* $\mathcal{H}_D$ and *quantum decision rule* D is a member of $Ch(\mathcal{H},\mathcal{H}_D)$, respectively. *Loss function* L is a non-negative function from $\Theta \times \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H}_D)$ to $\mathbb{R}$, such that

$$\mathsf{L}_\theta(X) \geq 0 \quad (X \geq 0)$$

and

$$\sup\left\{\frac{|\mathsf{L}_\theta(X) - \mathsf{L}_\theta(Y)|}{\|X-Y\|_1};\ X \geq 0, Y \geq 0, \operatorname{tr} X \leq 1, \operatorname{tr} Y \leq 1\right\} \leq 1. \tag{4}$$

For example:

1. $\mathsf{L}_\theta(X_\theta) := \|X_\theta - \rho_{0,\theta}\|_1$, with $\theta \to \rho_{0,\theta} \in \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H}_D)$ being continuous in $\|\cdot\|_1$.
2. Suppose $\mathcal{H}_D < \infty$. Then, for a continuous (in trace norm) function $\theta \to \rho_{0,\theta}$ and $\mathsf{L}_\theta(X) := 1 - \operatorname{tr}\sqrt{\rho_{0,\theta}^{1/2} X \rho_{0,\theta}^{1/2}}$ satisfies (4), due to

$$1 - \operatorname{tr}\sqrt{\rho_{0,\theta}^{1/2} X \rho_{0,\theta}^{1/2}} \leq \|\rho_{0,\theta} - X\|_1.$$

3. $\mathsf{L}_\theta(X) = \operatorname{tr} L_\theta X$. Here, $L_\theta \geq 0$, $\|L_\theta\| \leq 1$, $L_\theta \in \mathcal{LC}(\mathcal{H}_D)$. L_θ is called loss operator. and due to (4).

A classical decision M is a POVM in $\mathcal{H}$ over a classical decision space $(\mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{D})$. Also, one may consider probabilistic quantum decision. If $|\mathcal{D}| < \infty$, we can consider such decision as a CPTP map $D : \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H}_D)$:

$$D : X \to \bigoplus_{t=1}^{|\mathcal{D}|} p_t X_t,$$

and a proper loss function would be

$$\mathsf{L}_\theta(D(X_\theta)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{D}} p_{\theta,t} \|X_{\theta,t} - \rho_{0,\theta,t}\|_1 .$$

It is easy to see, by triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathsf{L}_\theta(D(X_\theta)) - \mathsf{L}_\theta(D'(X_\theta))| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{D}} \left\| p_{\theta,t} X_{\theta,t} - p'_{\theta,t} X'_{\theta,t} - \left(p_{\theta,t} - p'_{\theta,t}\right) \rho_{0,\theta,t} \right\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{D}} \left(\left\| p_{\theta,t} X_{\theta,t} - p'_{\theta,t} X'_{\theta,t} \right\|_1 + \left| p_{\theta,t} - p'_{\theta,t} \right| \right) \\ &\leq \|D(X_\theta) - D'(X_\theta)\|_1 . \end{aligned}$$

Hence, this case is also satisfies (4).

A quantum experiment $\mathcal{E}$ is said to be q-e-deficient relative to $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{K}, \{\sigma_\theta; \theta \in \Theta\})$ for k-decision problems (denoted by $\mathcal{E} \geq^q_{e,k} \mathcal{F}$), if and only if, for any if and only if, for for $\mathcal{H}_D$ with $\dim \mathcal{H}_D = k$, any loss function L with (4), any decision D on the experiment $\mathcal{F}$,

$$\inf_{D' \in Ch(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_D)} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \{\mathsf{L}_\theta(D'(\rho_\theta)) - \mathsf{L}_\theta(D(\sigma_\theta)) - e_\theta\} \leq 0. \tag{5}$$

When (5) is true for $k = \infty$, we say $\mathcal{E}$ is q-e-deficient relative to $\mathcal{F}$, and denote this situation by $\mathcal{E} \geq^q_e \mathcal{F}$. (Thus, $\mathcal{E} \geq^q_{e,\infty} \mathcal{F}$ means $\mathcal{E} \geq^q_e \mathcal{F}$).

Also, we can consider tasks with classical outputs. Different from purely classical setting, decision space is a measurable space $(\mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{D})$, and loss function $t \to l_\theta(t)$ is a measurable function taking values in $[0, 1]$.

$\mathcal{E}$ is said to be c-e-deficient relative to $\mathcal{F}$ (denoted by $\mathcal{E} \geq^c_e \mathcal{F}$), if and only if, for any loss function l with $0 \leq l_\theta(t) \leq 1$, for any decision M on the experiment $\mathcal{F}$,

$$\inf_{M'} \int_{\mathcal{D}} l_\theta(t) \operatorname{tr} \rho_\theta M'(\mathrm{d}t) \leq \int_{\mathcal{D}} l_\theta(t) \operatorname{tr} \sigma_\theta M(\mathrm{d}t) + e_\theta, \ \ \forall \theta \in \Theta. \tag{6}$$

c-e-deficiency for k-decision problems is defined by posing the restriction $|\mathcal{D}| \leq k$ and it is denoted by $\mathcal{E} \geq^c_{e,k} \mathcal{F}$.

q- and c-deficiency is defined in parallel with deficiency and denoted by $\delta^q(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ and $\delta^c(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$, respectively. Their k-decision versions $\delta^q_k(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ and $\delta^c_k(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F})$ are also defined analogously.

5 Some backgrounds from convex analysis

Theorem 3 *(Minimax theorem [11]). Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a convex, compact subset of locally convex vector space and let $\mathcal{V}$ be a convex subset of a vector space. Assume that $f : \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{V} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the following conditions: (1) $t \to f(t, v)$ is continuous and concave on $\mathcal{T}$ for every $v \in \mathcal{V}$. (2): $v \to f(t, v)$ is convex on $\mathcal{V}$ for every $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Then*

$$\inf_{v\in\mathcal{V}} \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} f(t, v) = \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} \inf_{v\in\mathcal{V}} f(t, v) = \inf_{v\in\mathcal{V}} f(t_0, v), \ \exists t_0 \in \mathcal{T}.$$

Corollary 4 *(Minimax theorem) Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a convex subspace of a vector space, and let $\mathcal{V}$ be a convex, compact subset of a locally convex vector space. Assume that $f : \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{V} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the following conditions: (1) $t \to f(t, v)$ is concave on $\mathcal{T}$ for every $v \in \mathcal{V}$. (2): $v \to f(t, v)$ is continuous convex on $\mathcal{V}$ for every $t \in \mathcal{T}$. Then*

$$\inf_{v\in\mathcal{V}} \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} f(t, v) = \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} \inf_{v\in\mathcal{V}} f(t, v) = \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} f(t, v_0), \exists v_0 \in \mathcal{V}.$$

Proof. Since

$$\inf_{v\in\mathcal{V}} \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} f(t, v) = -\sup_{v\in\mathcal{V}} \inf_{t\in\mathcal{T}} (-f(t, v)),$$

letting $f'(t, v) := -f(t, v)$ and and applying Theorem 3, we have the assertion. ■

Below, $\mathcal{P}_\Theta$ is the set of probability measures over Θ whose support is a finite set. Furnish × with descrete topology and Corollary 44.5 of [11], then, we obtain:

Lemma 5 *Let M_1, M_2 be a subset of $\mathbb{R}^\Theta$. Suppose that M_2 is subconvex and $\alpha(M_2) := \{f\,; f \geq g, \forall\, g \in M_2\}$ is closed in the product topology. Then, the following (i) and (ii) are equivallent:*

Theorem 6 **(i)** *For every $f \in M_1$, there is some $g \in M_2$ with $g \leq f$.*

(ii) *For any $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_\Theta$,*

$$\inf_{g\in M_2} \int_\Theta g \mathrm{d}\pi \leq \inf_{f\in M_1} \int_\Theta f \mathrm{d}\pi.$$

6 Quantum randomization criterion

Theorem 7 *$\mathcal{E}$ is q-e-deficient relative to $\mathcal{F}$ for k-decision problems if and only if each of the following three holds (below, $\dim \mathcal{H}_D = k$);*

(i) *For any finite subset $\Theta_0 \subset \Theta$, for any family $\{\mathsf{L}_\theta\}_{\theta\in\Theta_0}$ with (4), and for any $D \in Ch(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{H}_D)$ there exists a $D' \in Ch(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_D)$,*

$$\inf_{D'\in Ch(\mathcal{H},\mathcal{H}_D)} \sup_{\theta\in\Theta_0} \{\mathsf{L}_\theta(D'(\omega_\theta)) - \mathsf{L}_\theta(D(\eta_\theta)) - e_\theta\} \leq 0.$$

(ii) *For any finite subset* $\Theta_0 \subset \Theta$ *, for any loss operator* $\{L_\theta\}$*, any decision* $D \in Ch(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{H}_D)$ *on the experiment* $\mathcal{F}$*,*

$$\inf_{D' \in Ch(\mathcal{H},\mathcal{H}_D)} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} \{\operatorname{tr} L_\theta D'(\rho_\theta) - \operatorname{tr} L_\theta D(\sigma_\theta) - e_\theta\} \leq 0.$$

(iii) *For any loss operator* $\{L_\theta\}$*, any* k*-decision* D *on the experiment* $\mathcal{F}$ *,and any* $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_\Theta$*,*

$$\exists D'_\pi \in Ch(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_D)\ ,\ \int_\Theta \operatorname{tr} L_\theta D'_\pi(\rho_\theta)\, \mathrm{d}\pi \leq \int_\Theta \{\operatorname{tr} L_\theta D(\sigma_\theta) + e_\theta\}\, \mathrm{d}\pi.$$

(iv) *For any* D *on the experiment* $\mathcal{F}$*,*

$$\exists D'_0 \in Ch(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_D),\ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \{\|D'_0(\rho_\theta) - D(\sigma_\theta)\|_1 - e_\theta\} \leq 0,$$

Proof. Obfiously, (5)⇒ (i)⇒(ii)⇒ (iii), and (iv)⇒(5). Hence, we show (iii)⇒(iv). Since $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_\Theta$, the map

$$D' \to \int_\Theta \{\operatorname{tr} L_\theta D'(\rho_\theta) - \operatorname{tr} L_\theta D(\sigma_\theta) - e_\theta\}\, \mathrm{d}\pi$$

is continuous in the product topology. Since $Ch(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_D)$ is compact with respect to the product topology due to Lemma 1, Corollary 4 leads to ■

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{L_\theta : L_\theta \in \mathcal{LC}(\mathcal{K}), \|L\| \leq 1} \inf_{D' \in Ch(\mathcal{H},\mathcal{H}_D)} \int_\Theta \{\operatorname{tr} L_\theta D'(\rho_\theta) - \operatorname{tr} L_\theta D(\sigma_\theta) - e_\theta\}\, \mathrm{d}\pi \\
&= \inf_{D' \in Ch(\mathcal{H},\mathcal{H}_D)} \sup_{L_\theta : L_\theta \in \mathcal{LC}(\mathcal{K}), \|L\| \leq 1} \int_\Theta \{\operatorname{tr} L_\theta D'(\rho_\theta) - \operatorname{tr} L_\theta D(\sigma_\theta) - e_\theta\}\, \mathrm{d}\pi \\
&= \inf_{D' \in Ch(\mathcal{H},\mathcal{H}_D)} \int_\Theta \{\|D'(\rho_\theta) - D(\sigma_\theta)\|_1 - e_\theta\}\, \mathrm{d}\pi
\end{aligned}$$

Let $M_2 := \{g; g(\theta) = \|D'(\rho_\theta) - D(\sigma_\theta)\|_1, D' \in Ch(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_D)\}$. Letting π be the one concentrated at $\{\theta\}$, and appling Corollary 4, we have

$$\exists D'_\theta \in Ch(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_D) \inf_{D' \in Ch(\mathcal{H},\mathcal{H}_D)} \{\|D'(\rho_\theta) - D(\sigma_\theta)\|_1\} = \|D'_\theta(\rho_\theta) - D(\sigma_\theta)\|_1.$$

Therefore,

$$\alpha(M_2) = \{g; g(\theta) \geq \|D'_\theta(\rho_\theta) - D(\sigma_\theta)\|_1, D' \in Ch(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_D)\},$$

which is closed under the product topology. Obviously, $\alpha(M_2)$ is convex. Hence, letting $M_1 = \{e\}$ and applying Lemma 5, we obtain

$$\exists D'_0 \in Ch(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_D)\ \forall \theta \in \Theta \quad \|D'_0(\rho_\theta) - D(\sigma_\theta)\|_1 \leq e_\theta.$$

Hence, we have (iv).

Letting $\mathcal{H}_D = \mathcal{K}$ and $D = \mathbf{I}$, we obtain:

Theorem 8 $\mathcal{E} \geq^q_e \mathcal{F}$ *is equivalent to there is a CPTP map* Λ *with*

$$\|\Lambda(\rho_\theta) - \sigma_\theta\|_1 \leq e_\theta,\ \forall \theta \in \Theta. \tag{7}$$

.

7 Classical decision space

Lemma 9 *([11], Theorem 41.7)There is a positive linear oparator* $T : ba(\mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{D}) \to ca(\mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{D})$ *such that*

(i) $\|T\| = 1$,

(ii) $T(\mu)(\mathcal{D}) = \mu(\mathcal{D})$, *if* $\mu \geq 0$

(iii) $T|_{ca(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D})} = \mathrm{id}|_{ca(\mathcal{D},\mathfrak{D})}$

Theorem 10 $\mathcal{E} \geq_e^c \mathcal{F}$ *if and only if one of the following two holds:*

(i) *For any decision space* $(\mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{D})$*, for any measurable loss function* l *with* $0 \leq l_\theta(t) \leq 1$*, for any decision* M *on the experiment* $\mathcal{F}$*, and for any* $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_\Theta$*, there is some decision* M' *on the experiment* $\mathcal{E}$ *such that*

$$\int_\Theta \int_{t\in\mathcal{D}} l_\theta(t) \operatorname{tr} \rho_\theta M'(\mathrm{d}t)\, \mathrm{d}\pi \leq \int_\Theta \left\{ \int_{t\in\mathcal{D}} l_\theta(t) \operatorname{tr} \sigma_\theta M(\mathrm{d}t) + e_\theta \right\} \mathrm{d}\pi.$$

(ii) *For any decision space* $(\mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{D})$*, any decision* M *on the experiment* $\mathcal{F}$*, there is some decision* M' *on the experiment* $\mathcal{E}$ *such that*

$$\sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \left\{ \left\| f_{M'}(\rho_\theta) - f_M(\sigma_\theta) \right\|_1 - e_\theta \right\} \leq 0, .$$

Proof. (6)⇒(i), (ii)⇒(6) is trivial. Hence, we have to show (i)⇒(ii). Suppose (i) holds true. Then, using the argument parallel to the proof (iii)⇒(iv) (of Theorem 7, we have, for any $M \in Mes(\mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{D})$,

$$\exists f_0 \in \overline{Mes}(\mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{D}) \ \sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \left\{ \left\| f_0(\rho_\theta) - f_M(\sigma_\theta) \right\|_1 - e_\theta \right\} \leq 0.$$

Let T be as of Lemma 9,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \left\{ \left\| T \circ f_0(\rho_\theta) - f_M(\sigma_\theta) \right\|_1 - e_\theta \right\} \\ &= \sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \left\{ \left\| T \circ f_0(\rho_\theta) - T \circ f_M(\sigma_\theta) \right\|_1 - e_\theta \right\} \\ &\leq \sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \left\{ \left\| f_0(\rho_\theta) - f_M(\sigma_\theta) \right\|_1 - e_\theta \right\} \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then, $f_0' := T \circ f_0$, which is a bounded linear map from $\mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H})$ to $ca(\mathcal{D}, \mathfrak{D})$, satisfies $f_0' \geq 0$, and

$$f_0'(\rho)(\mathcal{D}) = T(f_0(\rho))(\mathcal{D}) = f_0(\rho)(\mathcal{D}) = \operatorname{tr} \rho, \ (\rho \geq 0).$$

Thus, there is a M' such that $f_{M'} = f_0'$, and (ii) is proved. ■

Using almost parallel argument, we have:

Theorem 11 *$\mathcal{E} \geq^{c}_{e,k} \mathcal{F}$ if and only if one of the following two holds:*

(i) *With $|\mathcal{D}| = k$, for any measurable loss function l with $0 \leq l_\theta(t) \leq 1$, for any $k-$decision M on the experiment $\mathcal{F}$, and for any $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_\Theta$, there is some k-decision M' on the experiment $\mathcal{E}$ such that*

$$\int_\Theta \sum_{t\in\mathcal{D}} l_\theta(t) \operatorname{tr} \rho_\theta M'(t) \,\mathrm{d}\pi \leq \int_\Theta \left\{ \sum_{t\in\mathcal{D}} l_\theta(t) \operatorname{tr} \sigma_\theta M(k) + e_\theta \right\} \mathrm{d}\pi.$$

(ii) *With $|\mathcal{D}| = k$, any k-decision M on the experiment $\mathcal{F}$, there is some k-decision M' on the experiment $\mathcal{E}$ such that*

$$\sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \left\{ \left\| f_{M'}(\rho_\theta) - f_M(\sigma_\theta) \right\|_1 - e_\theta \right\} \leq 0, .$$

In case $k = 2$, c-e-deficiency has more explicite expression. Since

$$p(\theta) \sum_{t\in\{0,1\}} l_\theta(t) \operatorname{tr} \rho_\theta M'(t) = p(\theta) \left\{ (l_\theta(0) - l_\theta(1)) \operatorname{tr} \rho_\theta M'(0) + l_\theta(1) \right\},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_\Theta \left\{ \sum_{t\in\mathcal{D}} l_\theta(t) \left(\operatorname{tr} \rho_\theta M'(t) - \operatorname{tr} \sigma_\theta M(t) \right) - e_\theta \right\} p(\theta) \,\mathrm{d}\mu \\ &= \int_\Theta p(\theta) \left\{ (l_\theta(0) - l_\theta(1)) \left(\operatorname{tr} \rho_\theta M'(0) - \operatorname{tr} \sigma_\theta M(0) \right) - e_\theta \right\} \mathrm{d}\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, without loss of generality, we can suppose $l_\theta(0) - l_\theta(1) = \pm 1$. Therefore, letting $\theta \to a_\theta$ be a measurable function with $|a_\theta| = p(\theta)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{M'} \int_\Theta \left\{ \sum_{t\in\mathcal{D}} l_\theta(t) \left(\operatorname{tr} \rho_\theta M'(t) - \operatorname{tr} \sigma_\theta M(t) \right) - e_\theta \right\} p(\theta) \,\mathrm{d}\mu \\ &= \inf_{M'} \operatorname{tr} \left(\int_\Theta a_\theta \rho_\theta \mathrm{d}\mu \right) M'(0) - \operatorname{tr} \left(\int_\Theta a_\theta \sigma_\theta \mathrm{d}\mu \right) M(0) - \int_\theta |a_\theta| \, e_\theta \mathrm{d}\mu \\ &= - \left\| \int_\Theta a_\theta \rho_\theta \mathrm{d}\mu \right\|_1 - \operatorname{tr} \left(\int_\Theta a_\theta \sigma_\theta \mathrm{d}\mu \right) M(0) - \int_\theta |a_\theta| \, e_\theta \mathrm{d}\mu \leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Since this holds for any M, we have

$$- \left\| \int_\Theta a_\theta \rho_\theta \mathrm{d}\mu \right\|_1 + \left\| \int_\Theta a_\theta \sigma_\theta \mathrm{d}\mu \right\|_1 - \int_\theta |a_\theta| \, e_\theta \mathrm{d}\mu \leq 0,$$

or

$$\left\| \int_\Theta a_\theta \rho_\theta \mathrm{d}\mu \right\|_1 \geq \left\| \int_\Theta a_\theta \sigma_\theta \mathrm{d}\mu \right\|_1 - \int_\theta |a_\theta| \, e_\theta \mathrm{d}\mu,$$

where $\theta \to a_\theta$ is an arbitrary $L^1(\Theta, \mu)$ with $\int |a_\theta| \,\mathrm{d}\mu = 1$. Especially when $\Theta = \{0, 1\}$, this is equivalent to

$$\|\rho_0 - s\rho_1\|_1 \geq \|\sigma_0 - s\sigma_1\|_1 - e_0 - se_1,\ \forall s \geq 0. \tag{8}$$

In case $\dim \mathcal{H} = \dim \mathcal{K} = 2$, it is known that

$$\|\rho_0 - s\rho_1\|_1 \geq \|\sigma_0 - s\sigma_1\|_1,\ \ \forall s \geq 0, \tag{9}$$

is necessary and sufficient for $\mathcal{E} \geq_0^q \mathcal{F}$ [2]. In other words, $\mathcal{E} \geq_0^q \mathcal{F}$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{E} \geq_{0,2}^c \mathcal{F}$. However, in case that $\dim \mathcal{H} = \dim \mathcal{K} = 3$, (9) fails to be sufficinet for $\mathcal{E} \geq_0^q \mathcal{F}$ [4].

In case of classical case, more strongly, (8), or $\mathcal{E} \geq_{e,2} \mathcal{F}$, is known to be equivalent to $\mathcal{E} \geq_e \mathcal{F}$ [12][13]. The following theorem is found independently in [8].

Theorem 12 *Suppose* $\Theta = \{0, 1\}$, *and* $[\rho_0, \rho_1] = 0$. *Then,* $\mathcal{E} \geq_e^c \mathcal{F}$ *if and only if (8) holds, or* $\mathcal{E} \geq_{e,2}^c \mathcal{F}$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}^M$ be a classical experiment consisted with Q_θ^M respecitively, where $Q_\theta^M(\mathrm{d}x) = \mathrm{tr}\, \sigma_\theta M(\mathrm{d}x)$. Then, by Theorem 10, $\mathcal{E} \geq_e^c \mathcal{F}$ if and only if

$$\mathcal{E} \geq_e \mathcal{F}^M, \forall M.$$

As noted above, this equivalent to [12]

$$\|\rho_0 - s\rho_1\|_1 \geq \left\|Q_0^M - sQ_1^M\right\|_1 - e_0 - se_1,\ \forall M,\ \forall s \geq 0.$$

Therefore, since

$$\max_M \left\|Q_0^M - sQ_1^M\right\|_1 = \|\sigma_0 - s\sigma_1\|_1,$$

we have the assertion. ■

8 Statistical morphism

[3] introduced the notion of *statistical morphism*, which we use here with some non-essential modifications. A map Γ from $\{\rho_\theta\}_{\theta \in \Theta} \subset \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H})$ into $\mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{K})$ is said to be k-statistical morphism if and only if, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and for k-decision M over $\mathcal{H}$, there exists a k-decision M' over $\mathcal{K}$ with

$$\sum_{t \in \mathcal{D}} |\mathrm{tr}\, \Gamma(\rho_\theta) M(t) - \mathrm{tr}\, \rho_\theta M'(t)| < \varepsilon,\ \forall \theta \in \Theta. \tag{10}$$

Under the assumptions (A') or (B), $\mathcal{E} \geq_{0,k}^c \mathcal{F}$ is equivalent to the existence of k-statistical morphism Γ on $\{\rho_\theta\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$ with $\Gamma(\rho_\theta) = \sigma_\theta$.

Obviously, any positive linear, and trace preserving map Γ with $\Gamma(\rho_\theta) = \sigma_\theta$, $\forall \theta \in \Theta$, is k-statistical morphism, for any k. The following lemma has some implications on its converse statement.

Lemma 13 *Suppose* $\dim\mathcal{H} < \infty$. *Then, any* k*-statistical morphism* Γ *on* $\{\rho_\theta\}_{\theta\in\Theta}$ *has linear, positive, and trace preserving extention* Γ' *to* $\mathrm{span}\,\{\rho_\theta\}_{\theta\in\Theta}$

Proof. Let $\{\rho_{\theta_i}\}_{i=1}^n$ be linear independent elements of $\{\rho_\theta\}_{\theta\in\Theta}$ and define Γ' by linear combination of $\{\Gamma(\rho_{\theta_i})\}_i$:

$$\Gamma'\left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\rho_{\theta_i}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i\Gamma(\rho_{\theta_i}).$$

Obviously, Γ' is linear and trace preserving. First, we prove $\Gamma(\rho_\theta) = \Gamma'(\rho_\theta)$; By definiton, for any M and for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is M' with (10). Let $\rho_\theta = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i\rho_{\theta_i}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{t\in\mathcal{D}} |\mathrm{tr}\,\Gamma(\rho_\theta)\,M(t) - \mathrm{tr}\,\rho_\theta M'(t)| \\
&= \sum_{t\in\mathcal{D}} \left|\mathrm{tr}\,\Gamma(\rho_\theta)\,M(t) - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \mathrm{tr}\,\rho_{\theta_i} M'(t)\right| \\
&= \sum_{t\in\mathcal{D}} \left|\mathrm{tr}\,\Gamma(\rho_\theta)\,M(t) - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \mathrm{tr}\,\Gamma(\rho_{\theta_i})\,M(t)\right| \\
&= \sum_{t\in\mathcal{D}} |\mathrm{tr}\,\Gamma(\rho_\theta)\,M(t) - \mathrm{tr}\,\Gamma'(\rho_\theta)\,M(t)| < \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Since ε is arbitrary, and M is arbitrary k-valued measurement, we have $\Gamma(\rho_\theta) = \Gamma'(\rho_\theta)$, and Γ' is a linear extention of Γ.

Finally, we prove that Γ' is positive on $\mathrm{span}\,\{\rho_\theta\}_{\theta\in\Theta}$. For any positive matrix $M \leq \mathbf{1}$ and any $\rho = \sum_i a_i\rho_{\theta_i} \geq 0$,

$$\mathrm{tr}\,\Gamma'(\rho)\,M = \mathrm{tr}\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\,\Gamma(\rho_{\theta_i})\,M \geq \mathrm{tr}\sum_{i=1}^n a_i\rho_{\theta_i}M' - n\varepsilon \geq -n\varepsilon.$$

Since $\varepsilon > 0$ and $M \geq 0$ are arbitrary, we have positivity of Γ' on $\mathrm{span}\,\{\rho_\theta\}_{\theta\in\Theta}$. ■

Theorem 14 *Suppose* $\dim\mathcal{H} < \infty$ *and* $\mathrm{span}\,\{\rho_\theta\}_{\theta\in\Theta}$ *is the totality of Hermitian matrices. Then,* $\mathcal{E} \geq^c_{0,k}\mathcal{F}$ *holds if and only if there is a positive trace preserving map* Γ *with* $\Gamma(\rho_\theta) = \sigma_\theta$, $\forall\theta\in\Theta$. *Namely,* $\mathcal{E} \geq^c_{0,2}\mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{E} \geq^c_{0,3}\mathcal{F}$, $\cdots$, $\mathcal{E} \geq^c_{0,k}\mathcal{F}$ *are all euqivalent to* $\mathcal{E} \geq^c_0\mathcal{F}$.

Proof. The first statement follows directly from Lemma 13. As for the second statement, it is obvious that $\mathcal{E} \geq^c_0\mathcal{F}$ implies $\mathcal{E} \geq^c_{0,2}\mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{E} \geq^c_{0,3}\mathcal{F}$, $\cdots$, $\mathcal{E} \geq^c_{0,k}\mathcal{F}$. Conversely, suppose $\mathcal{E} \geq^c_{0,2}\mathcal{F}$. Then by Lemma 13, there is a positive linear, and trace preserving map Γ with $\Gamma(\rho_\theta) = \sigma_\theta$, $\forall\theta\in\Theta$, which implies $\mathcal{E} \geq^c_0\mathcal{F}$. ■

Classically, it is known that $\mathcal{E} \geq_{0,2}\mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{E} \geq_{0,3}\mathcal{F}$, $\cdots$, $\mathcal{E} \geq_{0,k}\mathcal{F}$ are all equivalent to $\mathcal{E} \geq_0\mathcal{F}$, provided Θ is a finite set [12][13]. The above theorem is a quantum version of this statement.

9 Technicalities

9.1 Weak and weak* topology

For the detail of the following statements, see [5], for example. Let E and E' be a normed Banach space and the totality of continuous linear functional, respectively. If we take as the norm of $/f \in E'$ the operator norm $\|f\|$ as a functional, then E' become a normed linear space called conjugate space. E' is complete, and thus is a Banach space. The topology introduced by $\|f\|$ is called strong topology.

The weak* topology $\sigma(E', E)$ in E' is indtroduced as follows. For every $\alpha > 0$ and every finite number of elements x_i $(i = 1, \cdots, n)$, we denote by $W(x_1, \cdots x_n, \alpha)$ the set of all f such that $|f(x_i)| \leq \alpha$. The topology for which the sets $W(x_1, \cdots x_n, \alpha)$ form the fundamental system of the neighbours of zero is called weak* topology. In other words, an open set containig 0 is in a union of the sets $W(x_1, \cdots x_n, \alpha)$. The weak topology $\sigma(E, E')$ in E is defined by exchanging the role of E and E' above.

The weak and weak* topologies are locally convex topologies since sets $W(x_1, \cdots x_n, \alpha)$ are convex.

The sequence $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^{n}$ in E' is called weakly convergent to the functional f_0 if it converges to f_0 in the weak* topology. In order for $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ to be weakly convergent to f_0, it is necessary and sufficient that $\lim_{n\to\infty} f_n(x) = f_0(x)$ for every $x \in E$.

A convex set in a normed linear space E' has the same closure both in the initial topology and in the weak* topology $\sigma(E', E)$. In particular, if the sequence $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^{n}$ is weakly convergent to f_0, there exists a sequence of linear combinatitons $\{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \lambda_i^m f_i\}$ converging in the norm to f_0.

Every closed sphere in E' is compact in the weak* topology $\sigma(E', E)$ (Alaoglu's theorem).

9.2 Measure theory

A fintely additive set function ν defined on a finitely additive set family $\mathfrak{B}$ of a topological space Θ is said to be regular if and only if for each $E \in \mathfrak{B}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there are sets E', $E'' \in \mathfrak{B}$ such that $\overline{E'} \subset E \subset (E'')^{\circ}$ and $|\nu(C)| < \varepsilon$ for any $C \in \mathfrak{B}$ with $C \subset E'' - E'$.

Let ν be a regular and finitely additive set function defined on a σ-field $\mathfrak{B}$ of a compact space Θ. Then, ν is countablly additive (Theorem III.5.13, [7])

Baire σ-field of a topological space is the smallest σ-field which makes every continuous function measurable.

10 Compact covariant experiments

10.1 Compact covariant experiments

Let $\dim\mathcal{H}<\infty$, $\dim\mathcal{K}<\infty$. Let G be a compact group, and $g\to U_g\in\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{H})$ and $g\to V_g\in\mathrm{SU}(\mathcal{K})$ be representations of G. Suppose that there is a natural action $\theta\to g\theta$ of $g\in G$ on $\theta\in\Theta$. Moreover, we suppose that for any θ, there is $g\in G$ with $g0=\theta$. Then we consider the covariant experiments, which satisfy

$$\rho_{g\theta}=U_g\rho_\theta U_g^\dagger,\ \ \sigma_{g\theta}=V_g\sigma_\theta V_g^\dagger,$$

or

$$\rho_{g0}=U_g\rho_0 U_g^\dagger,\ \ \sigma_{g0}=V_g\sigma_0 V_g^\dagger.$$

We further suppose that the assumptions of 8, which are conditions (A') and (B), hold true. Then, Due to Theorem 8, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\delta^q(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{F})&=\inf_\Phi\sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\left\|\Phi(\rho_\theta)-\sigma_\theta\right\|_1\\&=\inf_\Phi\sup_{g\in G}\left\|\Phi\left(U_g\rho_0U_g^\dagger\right)-V_g\sigma_0V_g^\dagger\right\|_1\\&=\inf_\Phi\sup_{g\in G}\left\|V_g^\dagger\Phi\left(U_g\rho_0U_g^\dagger\right)V_g-\sigma_0\right\|_1.\end{aligned}$$

Denote by $\mathbf{M}$ the average with respect to Haar measure of G, and define

$$\Phi_*(\rho):=\mathbf{M}V_g^\dagger\Phi\left(U_g\rho_0U_g^\dagger\right)V_g.$$

Then, Φ_* is covariant,

$$\Phi_*\left(U_g\rho U_g^\dagger\right)=V_g\Phi_*(\rho)V_g^\dagger,\tag{11}$$

and, by convexity of the norm $\|\cdot\|_1$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{g\in G}\left\|V_g^\dagger\Phi\left(U_g\rho_0U_g^\dagger\right)V_g-\sigma_0\right\|_1\\&\geq\left\|\Phi_*(\rho_0)-\sigma_0\right\|_1\\&=\left\|V_g^\dagger\Phi_*\left(U_g\rho_0U_g^\dagger\right)V_g-\sigma_0\right\|_1,\forall g\in G.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\delta^q(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{F})=\inf_{\Phi_*}\left\|\Phi_*(\rho_0)-\sigma_0\right\|_1,$$

where Φ_* runs over all the CPTP maps with (11).

Let Ch_{Φ_*} be the Choi's representation of a channel Φ_*,

$$Ch_{\Phi_*}:=\Phi_*\otimes\mathbf{I}\left(\sum_{i,j=1}^{\dim\mathcal{H}}|i\rangle\,|i\rangle\,\langle j|\,\langle j|\right),$$

where $\{|i\rangle\}$ is a CONS of $\mathcal{H}$. Then, (11) can be written as

$$\left[\overline{U_g}\otimes V_g,Ch_{\Phi_*}\right]=0\,,\ (g\in G)\,,\tag{12}$$

10.2 Examples

Example 15 *$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{K} = \mathbb{C}^d$, $G = \mathrm{SU}(d)$, $U_g = g$, and $V_g = VgV^\dagger$ Then, Φ_* has to be depolarizaing channel,*

$$\Phi_*(X) := \frac{(1-\lambda)(\mathrm{tr}\, X)}{d}\mathbf{1} + \lambda V^\dagger X V, \quad (0 \leq \lambda \leq 1).$$

Hence,

$$\mathcal{E} \geq_0^q \mathcal{F} \Leftrightarrow \sigma_0 = \frac{\lambda}{d}\mathbf{1} + (1-\lambda) V^\dagger \rho_0 V.$$

Especially, suppose ρ_0 and σ_0 have the same spectrum. Then, although the set $\left\{U\rho_0 U^\dagger\right\}_{U\in\mathrm{SU}(d)}$ equals the set $\left\{U\sigma_0 U^\dagger\right\}_{U\in\mathrm{SU}(d)}$, $\mathcal{E} \not\geq_0^q \mathcal{F}$ unless $V^\dagger \rho_0 V = \sigma_0$.

Now, let $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{K} = \mathbb{C}^2$, and

$$V^\dagger \rho_0 V = \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} 1+u & 0 \\ 0 & 1-u \end{bmatrix} \quad (u \geq 0),$$
$$\sigma_0 = \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} 1+z & x-\sqrt{-1}y \\ x+\sqrt{-1}y & 1-z \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^q(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{F}) &= \inf_{\Phi_*} \left\|\Phi_*(\rho_0) - \sigma_0\right\|_1 \\ &= \inf_{\lambda:0\leq\lambda\leq 1} \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(z-\lambda u) + x^2 + y^2} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(z-u)^2 + x^2 + y^2}, & (z \geq u), \\ \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{x^2+y^2}, & (0 \leq z \leq u), \\ \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{z^2+x^2+y^2}, & (z \leq 0). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

When $z \leq 0$, the optimal $\Phi_*(\rho_0) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}$. Thus, best approximate experiment $\mathcal{E}'$ to $\mathcal{F}$ with $\mathcal{E} \geq_0^q \mathcal{E}'$ is $\mathcal{E}' = \left(\mathbb{C}^2, \left\{\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}\right\}, \Theta\right)$.

Example 16 *$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{K} = \mathbb{C}^d$, d is prime power, and $G = \{X_d^s Z_d^t\}_{s,t\in\{0,1,\cdots,d-1\}}$, where*

$$X_d = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Z_d = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_d & 0 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & 0 & \omega_d^2 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 & \omega_d^{d-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Also, $U_g = V_g = g$. Note that

$$Ch_{\Phi_*} = \sum_{t,s,t',s'\in\{0,1,\cdots,d-1\}} a_{t,s,t's'} X_d^t Z_d^s \otimes X_d^{t'} Z_d^{s'},$$

where $a_{t,s,t',s'}$ are complex numbers. Since

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(X_d^{t''}Z_d^{-s''}\otimes X_d^{t''}Z_d^{s''}\right)\left(X_d^tZ_d^s\otimes X_d^{t'}Z_d^{s'}\right)\\&=\omega_d^{s''\left(t'-t\right)-t''\left(s+s'\right)}\left(X_d^tZ_d^s\otimes X_d^{t'}Z_d^{s'}\right)\left(X_d^{t''}Z_d^{-s''}\otimes X_d^{t''}Z_d^{s''}\right),\end{aligned}$$

(12) implies that $a_{t,s,t's'}$ takes non-zero value for t,s, t',s' with $t'=t$ and $s'=d-s$. Therefore, considering that Ch_{Φ_*} is Hermitian, and that Φ_* is trace preserving, the space of channels satisfying (11) is (as a real vector space) d^2-1 dimensional. On the other hand, a channel

$$\Phi_*\left(\rho\right)=\sum_{t,s\in\{0,1,\cdots,d-1\}}p_{t,s,t's'}\left(X_d^tZ_d^s\right)\rho\left(X_d^tZ_d^s\right)^\dagger \tag{13}$$

satisfies (11), and the space of channels with (13) is d^2-1. Hence, (11) is equivalent to (13).

Therefore,

$$\delta^q\left(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{F}\right)=\min_{\rho'}\left\|\rho'-\sigma_0\right\|_1$$

where ρ' moves all over the convex hull of the set $\{\left(X_d^tZ_d^s\right)\rho_0\left(X_d^tZ_d^s\right)\,;\,t,s\in\{0,1,\cdots,d-1\}\}$.

Especially, when $d=2$, letting $\vec{x}_0=(x_{01},x_{02},x_{03})$ and $\vec{y}_0$ be the Bloch representation of ρ_0 and σ_0, respectively, we have

$$\delta^q\left(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{F}\right)=\min_{\vec{x}}\left\|\vec{x}-\vec{y}_0\right\|,$$

where and $\vec{x}$ moves all over the convex hull of (x_{01},x_{02},x_{03}), $(-x_{01},-x_{02},x_{03})$, $(x_{01},-x_{02},-x_{03})$, and $(-x_{01},x_{02},-x_{03})$.

11 Translation experiments

11.1 Models and questions

Let $\dim\mathcal{H}=\dim\mathcal{K}=\infty$ (countable), and define

$$\rho_\theta:=W_{A\theta}\rho W_{A\theta}^\dagger,\ \ \sigma_\theta:=W_{B\theta}\sigma W_{B\theta}^\dagger,$$

where

$$W_\theta:=e^{\sqrt{-1}\left(\theta^1P-\theta^2Q\right)}.\,\theta\in\mathbb{R}^2,$$

is a Weyl operator, and A and B are real invertible 2×2 matrices. Appling Theorem 8, we have

$$\delta^q\left(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{F}\right)=\inf_\Phi\sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\left\|\Phi\left(\rho_\theta\right)-\sigma_\theta\right\|_1.$$

11.2 Restriction to covariant maps

The argument of this section draws upon [9]. For any Φ, define

$$\Phi_\theta(X) := W_{B\theta}^\dagger \Phi\left(W_{A\theta} X W_{A\theta}^\dagger\right) W_{B\theta}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta^q(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{F}) &= \inf_\Phi \sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \|\Phi_\theta(\rho)-\sigma\|_1 \\
&= \inf_\Phi \sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \sup_{X\geq 0, \|X\|\leq 1} \mathrm{tr}\,(\Phi_\theta(\rho)-\sigma)\,X \\
&= \inf_\Phi \sup_{X\geq 0, \|X\|\leq 1} \sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \mathrm{tr}\,(\Phi_\theta(\rho)-\sigma)\,X \\
&\geq \inf_\Phi \sup_{X\geq 0, \|X\|\leq 1} \mathbf{M}_\theta \mathrm{tr}\,(\Phi_\theta(\rho)-\sigma)\,X,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{M}_\theta$ is the invariant mean of the translation group in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Note, if ρ is a density operator, the map

$$\Phi_*(\rho) : X \to \mathbf{M}_\theta \mathrm{tr}\,\Phi_\theta(\rho)\,X$$

is linear and bounded, and maps $\mathbf{1}$ to 1. Also, the mapping $\Phi_* : \rho \to \Phi_*(\rho)$ is linear, and covariant :

$$\Phi_*\left(W_{A\theta}\rho W_{A\theta}^\dagger\right)[X] = \Phi_*(\rho)\left[W_{B\theta}^\dagger X W_{B\theta}\right]. \tag{14}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \sup_{X\geq 0, \|X\|\leq 1} \left(\Phi_*(\rho_\theta)[X] - \mathrm{tr}\,\sigma_\theta X\right) \\
&= \sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \sup_{X\geq 0, \|X\|\leq 1} \left(\Phi_*(\rho)\left[W_{B\theta}^\dagger X W_{B\theta}\right] - \mathrm{tr}\,\sigma W_{B\theta}^\dagger X W_{B\theta}\right) \\
&= \sup_{X\geq 0, \|X\|\leq 1} \left(\Phi_*(\rho)[X] - \mathrm{tr}\,\sigma X\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, in optimizing Φ, we just have to consider Φ_* with covariant property (14).

Φ_* is seemingly difficult to handle, since its output state may not be normal, i.e., may not have the density. However, it turns out that Φ_* with non-normal output is not optimal. Since $\mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H})$ is the dual of the space of compact operators $\mathcal{LC}(\mathcal{H})$, there is a positive $Y_\rho \in \mathcal{S}_1(\mathcal{H})$ with

$$\Phi_*(\rho)[X] = \mathrm{tr}\,Y_\rho X, \ \forall X \in \mathcal{LC}(\mathcal{H}).$$

Consider the map $\rho \to \sum_{i=1}^\infty \Phi_*(\rho)[|i\rangle\langle i|] = \mathrm{tr}\,Y_\rho$. Since this is linear in ρ and positive, there is a positive operator T with

$$\mathrm{tr}\,Y_\rho = \mathrm{tr}\,T\rho.$$

Due to covariant property of Φ_* (14), T commutes $W_{B\theta}$ for all $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Therefore, $T = c\mathbf{1}$. Thus, $c = \operatorname{tr} Y_\rho$ is independent of the input ρ. Therefore, $\rho_* := \frac{1}{c} Y_\rho$ is a density operator. We denote by Φ'_* the CPTP map which sends ρ to ρ_*.

Letting $\{A_n\}$ be a sequence of compact operators such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \operatorname{tr}\,(\sigma - c\rho_*)\,X_n = \operatorname{tr}\,[\sigma - c\rho_*]_+$ $(0 \le c \le 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{X\ge 0, \|X\|\le 1} \left(\Phi_*(\rho)[X] - \operatorname{tr}\sigma X\right) \\
&= \sup_{X\ge 0, \|X\|\le 1} \left|\Phi_*(\rho)[X] - \operatorname{tr}\sigma X\right| \\
&\ge \lim_{n\to\infty} \left|\operatorname{tr}\,(\sigma - c\rho_*)\,X_n\right| \\
&= \operatorname{tr}\,[\sigma - c\rho_*]_+ \\
&\ge \operatorname{tr}\,[\sigma - \rho_*]_+ = \|\sigma - \rho_*\|_1 = \left\|\Phi'_*(\rho) - \sigma\right\|_1 .
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Therefore, Φ'_* is always better than Φ_*.

After all, we have

$$\inf_{\Phi} \sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \|\Phi(\rho_\theta) - \sigma_\theta\|_1 = \inf_{\Phi} \|\Phi(\rho) - \sigma\|_1 ,$$

where Φ runs over all the CPTP maps with

$$\Phi\left(W_{A\theta}\rho W_{A\theta}^\dagger\right) = W_{B\theta}\Phi(\rho)\,W_{B\theta}^\dagger, \tag{16}$$

or

$$\Phi^*\left(W_{B\theta}^\dagger X W_{B\theta}\right) = W_{A\theta}^\dagger \Phi^*(X)\,W_{A\theta}.$$

11.3 Characterization of covariant maps

Inserting $X = W_\xi$, one has

$$\Phi^*\left(W_{B\theta}^\dagger X W_{B\theta}\right) = W_{A\theta}^\dagger \Phi^*(X)\,W_{A\theta}.$$

$$e^{-\sqrt{-1}\xi^T J B\theta} W_{A\theta}\Phi^*(W_\xi) = \Phi^*(W_\xi)\,W_{A\theta},$$

where

$$J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since this holds for any θ, we have

$$\Phi^*(W_\xi) = c(\xi)\,W_{C\xi},$$

where C satisfies

$$C^T J A = J B.$$

Using the identity

$$A^T J A = (\det A)\,J,$$

or

$$JA = (\det A)\, A^{T-1} J,$$

we have

$$C = \frac{\det B}{\det A} A B^{-1}.$$

According to Theorem 2.3 of [6], for Φ^* to be trace preserving, if $\det A \neq \det B$, $c(\xi)$ has to be a non-commutative characteristic function

$$c(\xi) = \operatorname{tr} \rho' W_{\Omega \xi},$$

where ρ' is a density matrix and Ω is a (non-zero) matrix satisfying

$$J - C^T J C = \Omega^T J \Omega,$$

or

$$\Omega = (1 - \det C)^{1/2} S = \left(1 - \frac{\det B}{\det A}\right)^{1/2} S,$$

with

$$\det S = 1.$$

Hence,

$$\operatorname{tr} \Phi(\rho) W_\xi = \operatorname{tr} \rho \Phi^*(W_\xi) = \operatorname{tr} \rho' W_{\Omega\xi} \operatorname{tr} \rho W_{C\xi}. \tag{17}$$

When $A = B$, $\Omega = 0$. In this case, $c(\xi)$ is a characteristic function of a classical probability distribution F over $\mathbb{R}^2$,

$$c(\xi) = \int e^{\sqrt{-1}\left(\xi^1 x^2 - \xi^2 x^1\right)} \frac{\mathrm{d}F(x)}{2\pi},$$

and we have

$$\operatorname{tr} \rho \Phi^*(W_\xi) = c(\xi) \operatorname{tr} \rho W_\xi. \tag{18}$$

Letting P_ρ be the P-function of ρ, respectively, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{tr} \Phi(\rho) W_\xi &= \operatorname{tr} \int P_{\Phi(\rho)}(z) W_\xi W_z |0\rangle\langle z| \frac{\mathrm{d}\, z}{2\pi} = \operatorname{tr} \int P_{\Phi(\rho)}(z)\, e^{\sqrt{-1}\left(\xi^1 z^2 - \xi^2 z^1\right)} W_z W_\xi |0\rangle\langle z| \frac{\mathrm{d}\, z}{2\pi} \\ &= \langle 0|\, \xi\rangle \int P_{\Phi(\rho)}(z)\, e^{\sqrt{-1}\left(\xi^1 z^2 - \xi^2 z^1\right)} \frac{\mathrm{d}\, z}{2\pi},\end{aligned}$$

and thus,

$$\int P_{\Phi(\rho)}(z)\, e^{\sqrt{-1}\left(\xi^1 z^2 - \xi^2 z^1\right)} \frac{\mathrm{d}\, z}{2\pi} = c(\xi) \int P_\rho(z)\, e^{\sqrt{-1}\left(\xi^1 z^2 - \xi^2 z^1\right)} \frac{\mathrm{d}\, z}{2\pi}.$$

Therefore, in case $A = B$, (16) is equivalent to

$$P_{\Phi(\rho)}(x) = \int P_\rho(x - y)\, \mathrm{d}F(y).$$

Therefore, denoting convolution by '$*$',

$$\begin{aligned}\inf_{\Phi} \sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \|\Phi(\rho_\theta) - \sigma_\theta\|_1 &= \inf\left\{\|\rho' - \sigma\|_1 ; \exists F\ P_{\rho'} = P_\rho * F\right\} \qquad (19) \\ &\leq \|P_\sigma - P_\rho * F\|_1, \quad \forall F.\end{aligned}$$

11.4 Gaussian shift models

When ρ is gaussian state with mean value zero, ρ satisfies

$$\mathrm{tr}\,\rho W_\xi = e^{-\xi^T \Sigma_\rho \xi/4}, \tag{20}$$

where

$$\Sigma_\rho = \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{tr}\,\rho Q^2 & \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}\,\rho\,(PQ+QP) \\ \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}\,\rho\,(PQ+QP) & \mathrm{tr}\,\rho P^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The necessary and sufficient condition for ρ' with $e^{-\xi^T \Sigma \xi/4} = \mathrm{tr}\,\rho' W_\xi$ to exist is

$$\Sigma + \sqrt{-1}J \geq 0,$$

which is, being 2×2 matrices, equivalent to

$$\det \Sigma \geq 1.$$

Suppose $A = B$. Then, due to (18),

$$\mathcal{E} \geq_0^q \mathcal{F} \Leftrightarrow \Sigma_\rho \leq \Sigma_\sigma.$$

Suppose $\det A \neq \det B$. Then, if $\mathcal{E} \geq_0^q \mathcal{F}$, due to (17), $\mathrm{tr}\,\rho' W_{\Omega\xi}$ is also Gaussian, $\mathrm{tr}\,\rho' W_\xi = e^{-\xi^T \Sigma_{\rho'} \xi/4}$, or

$$\mathrm{tr}\,\rho' W_{\Omega\xi} = e^{-\xi^T \Omega^T \Sigma_{\rho'} \Omega \xi/4}.$$

Also, by (17), we have

$$\Sigma_\sigma = \Omega^T \Sigma_{\rho'} \Omega + C^T \Sigma_\rho C,$$

or, with $A' = AB^{-1}$

$$\Sigma_\sigma = \left(1 - (\det A')^{-1}\right) S^T \Sigma_{\rho'} S + (\det A')^{-2} A'^T \Sigma_\rho A'.$$

Therefore, for ρ' with $\mathrm{tr}\,\rho' W_\xi = e^{-\xi^T \Sigma_{\rho'} \xi/4}$ to exist, the following is necessary and sufficient :

$$\Sigma_\sigma - (\det A')^{-2} A'^T \Sigma_\rho A' \geq 0 \tag{21}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\det\left[\left(1 - (\det A')^{-1}\right)^{-1} S^{T-1} \left(\Sigma_\sigma - (\det A')^{-2} A'^T \Sigma_\rho A'\right) S^{-1}\right] \\ &= \left(1 - (\det A')^{-1}\right)^{-2} \det\left[\left(\Sigma_\sigma - (\det A')^{-2} A'^T \Sigma_\rho A'\right)\right] \geq 1. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

This gives the necessary and sufficient condition for $\mathcal{E} \geq_0^q \mathcal{F}$. With $\Sigma_\sigma = \Sigma_\rho = a^2\mathbf{1}$, these conditions can be written as

$$A'^T A' \geq \mathbf{1}, \tag{23}$$

$$\det\left[\left(\mathbf{1} - (\det A')^{-2} A'^T A'\right)\right] \geq a^{-4}\left(1 - (\det A')^{-1}\right)^2. \tag{24}$$

(The first inequality is derived from (21) by elementary but tedious component wise computation.)

In classical case, with $\Sigma_\sigma = \Sigma_\rho = a^2 \mathbf{1}$, $\mathcal{E} \geq_0 \mathcal{F}$ is equivalent to (23) [13]. In quantum case, when $a \gg 1$, (23) implies (24), and thus $\mathcal{E} \geq_0^q \mathcal{F}$.

However, when a is not very large, quantum case is very much different from classical case. For example, suppose $a = 1$. Without loss of generality, let

$$A' = O \begin{bmatrix} \alpha & \gamma \\ 0 & \beta \end{bmatrix},$$

where O is an orthogonal matrix. Then, (24) is written as

$$-(\alpha - \beta)^2 - \gamma^2 \geq 0.$$

Hence, $\mathcal{E} \geq_0^q \mathcal{F}$ is equivalent to

$$A' = \alpha O,$$

where $\alpha \geq 1$ and O is an orthogonl matrix. This is very much stronger than the classical condition (23).

References

[1] P. Alberti, "On the simultaneous transformation of density operators by means of a completely positive", Unity Preserving Linear Map. Publ. RIMS (Kyoto), 21:617–644, 1985.

[2] P. Alberti and A. Uhlmann, "A problem relating to positive linear maps on matrix algebras", Rep. Math. Phys. 18, 163-176 (1980).

[3] F. Buscemi, Comparison of quantum statistical models: a "Quantum Blackwell theorem", http://arxiv.org/abs/1004.3794 (2010).

[4] A. Che fles, R. Jozsa, and A. Winter, "On the existence of physical transformations between sets of quantum states "arXiv:quant-ph/0307227.

[5] J. B. Conway, "A Cource in Functional Analysis", (2nd ed.) Springer-Verlag (1997).

[6] B.Demoen, P.Vanheuverzwijn and A.Verbeure, "Completely positive maps on the CCR-algebra," Lett. Math. Phys. 2, 161 (1977).

[7] N. Dunford, J. Schwartz, "Linear Operators, Part I", Interscience (1952).

[8] A. Jencova, private communication (2011).

[9] O. Kruger, "Quantum Information Theory with Gaussian Systems", doctral dissertation (2006).

[10] J. L. Kelley, "General Topology", Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag (1975).

[11] H. Strasser, "Mathematical Theory of Statistics", de Gruyter (1985).

[12] E. Torgersen, "Comparison of statistical experiments when the parameter space is finite", Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Geb. 16, 219-249 (1970).

[13] E. Torgersen, "Comparison of Statistical Experiments", Cambridge University Press (1991).